

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-26 and cancelled claims 4 and 17 to overcome non prior art related rejections. The Examiner has objected to claim 2 due to an improper dependency. The Examiner has rejected claims 4-7, 11-13, 17-19, and 21-26 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-8, 10-14, 16-21, and 23-26 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over claimed Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of US Patent 6,091,340 to Lee et al ("Lee"). The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 9, 15, and 22 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over claimed Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of US Patent 6,510,380 to Curatolo et al ("Curatolo").

Claim Objection:

The Examiner has objected to claim 2 because claim 2 is dependent on itself. Applicant has amended claim 2 to be dependent on claim 1. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Section 112 Rejections:

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-7, 11-13, 17-19, and 21-26 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has argued that mobile components can not be fixed. Applicant has amended the claims to clarify that the components,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

controllers, means, and systems are fixably located within the passenger vehicle. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Section 103 Rejections:

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-8, 10-14, 16-21, and 23-26 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over claimed Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of US Patent 6,091,340 to Lee et al ("Lee"). The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 9, 15, and 22 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over claimed Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of US Patent 6,510,380 to Curatolo et al ("Curatolo").

Claim 1:

Claim 1, as amended recites:

An alarm system component fixably located within a passenger vehicle, the component comprising:

- a) means fixably located within the passenger vehicle for wirelessly receiving signals from an alarm controller fixably located within the passenger vehicle; and
- b) means fixably located within the passenger vehicle for performing an alarm indication function based on signals received from the alarm controller.

As amended claim 1 the component includes means for wirelessly receiving signals from an alarm controller and means for performing an alarm indication function based on signals from the alarm controller where both the means and the alarm controller are fixably located within the passenger vehicle. The Lee patent is directed to an apparatus and method of wirelessly controlling NON alarm indication function means via a NON fixed apparatus controller or device. The apparatus controller is a wireless remote that a user may employ to control an engine function or automobile device (such a fuel pump, hood latch, starter). These devices do NOT

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

provide an alarm indication function. In addition the remote is NOT fixably located within a passenger vehicle. The Curatolo patent is directed to two signaling units that may work in combination to communicate with a monitoring station. These signals units do NOT provide alarm indication function and these signaling units are NOT fixably located within a passenger vehicle. In view of these critical, claimed differences, Applicant respectfully contends that claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references. In view of these arguments, Applicant contends that claim 1 is allowable over the art of reference.

Claim 2-7:

Claims 2-7 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1. Applicant respectfully contends that these claims are also allowable over the references for these reasons and the reasons recited for claim 1. Claim 2 additionally recites that an alarm is indicated if a signal has not been received for a predetermined time interval. The Lee patent requires an active input to control NON alarm indicator devices and the Curatolo patent does not discuss an alarm indicator. Claim 5 further recites that the alarm controller is located in a first compartment and the wirelessly means is located in a separate, physical compartment of the vehicle. The Lee patent disclosures a remote controller, not FIXABLY located in a vehicle let alone a separate physical compartment from the alarm indicator. Claims 6 and 7 further recite the specific compartments. Applicant respectfully contends that these claims are also allowable over the references for these reasons and the reasons recited for claim 1 and additional reasons cited above.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Claim 8-13:

Claim 8 recites an alarm system fixably located within a passenger vehicle including an alarm controller FIXABLY located within the passenger vehicle and an alarm controller FIXABLY located within the passenger vehicle, the alarm component enabling wireless data communications with alarm controller. Applicant respectfully contends that these claims are also allowable over the references for these reasons and the reasons recited for claim 1. Claim 9 additionally recites that an alarm is indicated if a signal has not been received for a predetermined time interval. The Lee patent requires an active input to control NON alarm indicator devices and the Curatolo patent does not discuss an alarm indicator. Claim 11 further recites that the alarm controller is located in a first compartment and the wirelessly means is located in a separate, physical compartment of the vehicle. The Lee patent disclosures a remote controller, not FIXABLY located in a vehicle let alone a separate physical compartment from the alarm indicator. Claims 12 and 13 further recite the specific compartments. Applicant respectfully contends that these claims are also allowable over the references for these reasons and the reasons recited for claim 1 and additional reasons cited above.

Claim 14-20:

Claim 14 recites an alarm system component method the system component fixably located within a passenger vehicle including wirelessly receiving signals from an alarm controller FIXABLY located within the passenger vehicle and performing an alarm indication function based on alarm controller signal. Applicant respectfully contends that these claims are also allowable over the references for these reasons and the reasons recited for claim 1. Claim 15 additionally recites that an alarm is indicated if a signal has not been received for a

predetermined time interval. The Lee patent requires an active input to control NON alarm indicator devices and the Curatolo patent does not discuss an alarm indicator. Claim 18 further recites that the alarm controller is located in a first compartment and the wirelessly means is located in a separate, physical compartment of the vehicle. The Lee patent disclosures a remote controller, not FIXABLY located in a vehicle let alone a separate physical compartment from the alarm indicator. Claims 19 and 20 further recite the specific compartments. Applicant respectfully contends that these claims are also allowable over the references for these reasons and the reasons recited for claim 1 and additional reasons cited above.

Claim 21-26:

Claim 21 recites a method of installing an alarm system including FIXABLY installing in the passenger vehicle an alarm controller operable to enable wireless data communications in the passenger vehicle and FIXABLY installing in the passenger vehicle an alarm component operable to enable wireless data communications with the alarm controller. Applicant respectfully contends that these claims are also allowable over the references for these reasons and the reasons recited for claim 1. Further the present invention enables simple installation of an alarm system in a vehicle since wires are needed between the alarm controller and alarm controller. Claim 22 additionally recites that an alarm is indicated if a signal has not been received for a predetermined time interval. The Lee patent requires an active input to control NON alarm indicator devices and the Curatolo patent does not discuss an alarm indicator. Claim 24 further recites that the alarm controller is located in a first compartment and the wirelessly means is located in a separate, physical compartment of the vehicle. The Lee patent disclosures a

remote controller, not FIXABLY located in a vehicle let alone a separate physical compartment from the alarm indicator. Claims 25 and 26 further recite the specific compartments. Applicant respectfully contends that these claims are also allowable over the references for these reasons and the reasons recited for claim 1 and additional reasons cited above.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Merle Richman, Applicants' Attorney at 858.551.2030. For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



April 18, 2006
Date

Merle Richman
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38282

Merle Richman
Patent Attorney
PO Box 3333
La Jolla, CA 92038-3333
Tel. 858 320-2030

BEST AVAILABLE COPY